

associated Aids, their families and their friends. These folks have put aside their differences, rallied together and learned to use the legislative process to further their goals. I am extremely proud of their work and pledge to redouble my efforts to make sure this bill gets heard during this Congress.

Hemophilia is an inherited blood-clotting disorder causing serious internal bleeding episodes that, if left untreated, can lead to disfigurement and even death. To help control and prevent such bleeding, hemophiliacs rely on blood-products, which are manufactured and sold by pharmaceutical companies. Because these products are made from the pooled blood of thousands of people, the potential for infection with blood-borne disease among those who use them is very high, something that has been well-known for decades. In fact, since the 1970's, the hemophilia community has grappled with the serious consequences of hepatitis, a debilitating chronic illness. But in the early 1980's, a much more deadly villain struck, as nearly one-half of all people with hemophilia in the United States became infected with the virus that causes aids. Today they are dying at a rate of about one each day.

Mr. Speaker, we have long argued that the Federal Government shares responsibility for this devastating situation, because it failed to respond to the early warning signs that Aids was transmissible by blood and blood products. During the early years of Aids, repeated opportunities to reduce the likelihood of contaminated blood entering the supply of blood products were missed.

This conclusion was supported by a 2-year study, conducted by a distinguished panel at the institute of medicine. In a report entitled "HIV and the blood supply," the IOM panel concluded that the Federal agencies missed opportunities to protect the public health because they consistently chose the least aggressive response to the early warning signs. The report concluded that the system—which was charged with protecting the blood supply, ensuring the safety of manufactured blood products, and informing the public of risks—failed to deal with the relatively well-known problem of hepatitis and was therefore unprepared to confront the crisis of Aids. Mr. Speaker, the premise behind the Ricky Ray bill is that the Government has a unique responsibility for regulating the safety of blood products, based on a Federal blood policy and several major statutes that establish the regulatory framework for blood.

Members should also understand that the legal system classifies blood products in a unique way. Even though they are commercially marketed and sold, blood products enjoy special status under the so-called "blood shield" laws of every State, which protect against product liability lawsuits.

Given these facts, we have concluded that Government has a unique obliga-

tion to assist the victims and so the Ricky Ray bill authorizes the creation of a trust fund, administered by the Attorney General, to provide \$125,000 in assistance to each victim who meets strict eligibility criteria.

The trust fund would sunset after 5 years, would be capped at \$1 billion and would be subject to funding through annual appropriations.

Mr. Speaker, the United States has yet to set up an assistance program, even though more than 20 other nations have done so. Just last month the Government of Japan and five drug companies—including several American firms—agreed to provide the equivalent of \$430,000 to each of the estimated 1,800 victims in Japan, with the government paying 44 percent and the companies paying 56 percent.

It is time the United States took its share of responsibility for what happened to 8,000 American hemophiliacs during the 1980's. Please join the majority of bipartisan support of the Ricky Ray Hemophilia Relief Fund Act.

#### SEEKING AN HONEST DEBATE ON THE ISSUES WITH REGARD TO BILINGUAL EDUCATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Guam [Mr. UNDERWOOD] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, today I would like to respond to assertions that English-only proponents are making about bilingual education in their efforts to advance their cause.

Yesterday a Member came to this floor to praise Mr. Thomas Doluisio, for his fight against bilingual education. The Member went on to say that the National Association of Bilingual Education officially condemned Mr. Doluisio at their 1994 convention. This information, taken from a Wall Street Journal editorial by John Miller of the Heritage Foundation and Center for Equal Opportunity, is not accurate. The National Association of Bilingual Education has never condemned any individual officially or otherwise, including Mr. Doluisio. His story may have been discussed among bilingual educators, but this is a far cry from official condemnation by a respected national organization. I am informed that a letter was sent by the National Association of Bilingual Education refuting the Wall Street Journal article.

There have been other statements made by English-only proponents that I take issue with. One of the statements continuously used by English-only advocates is that bilingual education costs the taxpayers \$8-\$12 billion a year. This figure is inaccurate and is an exaggeration of the costs of educating bilingual children. The \$8-\$12 billion is the total cost of education for children who are limited English proficient, not just students being taught in bilingual programs. Furthermore, it multiplies the total cost of educating

these children not just the marginal cost of bilingual education. If we wanted to save \$8-\$12 billion, we'd have to kick these 2.3 million kids out of school entirely!

In fact, the Institute for Research in English Acquisition and Development Journal, funded by U.S. English, an English-only advocacy group, has now come forth and stated that the \$8-\$12 billion figure is misleading. The true cost of bilingual education is the additional funds necessary to shift from a monolingual English program to a bilingual program. The total Federal expenditure for bilingual education is \$156 million not \$8-\$12 billion.

This week the other body will debate the Immigration Control and Financial Responsibility Act. During that debate, an amendment to include an English-only requirement will be offered. It is clear from this maneuver that proponents would rather dodge a floor clear from this maneuver that proponents would rather dodge a floor debate on a separate English-only bill. The administration has recently announced its support of the Senate immigration bill, but if English-only language is included members of Clinton's cabinet are certain to recommend a veto.

I am not pointing these things out in an effort to discredit those who are not being totally honest in their arguments. What we seek is an honest debate on the issues, not a war of anecdotes and imaginative mathematics. Let's stick to the facts and keep fiction out of this debate.

□ 1545

I dare say that I am probably the only Member of this institution who has been a bilingual education professional, and if anyone in the House wants to understand bilingual education at its very basic and grassroots levels, I stand open to be contacted.

#### PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. Speaker, last night I missed rollcall No. 117. Had I been present, I would have voted "nay" on it.

#### D.C. EMANCIPATION COMMEMORATION SPEECH

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. COBLE). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANZULLO] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MANZULLO. Mr. Speaker, today commemorates one of the most significant events that has ever taken place in the history of this great country. One hundred thirty-four years ago today Congress emancipated over 3,000 slaves owned by residents of the District of Columbia. This city's slaves were the first to be freed in our country—9 months before President Abraham Lincoln's Emancipation Proclamation took effect on January 1, 1863.

Sometime in the early 1860's, while this Nation was embroiled in a civil war, a conversation took place between Senator Charles Sumner of Massachusetts and President Abraham Lincoln. Sumner asked the President, "Mr. President, do you realize who is the largest slaveholder in the United States?" The President had to think, and the Senator said, "It is you, Mr. President."

At the time there were over 3,000 slaves in the District of Columbia who were stuck in slavery and bondage and could be freed by an act of Congress. That conversation began a monumental epic in the history of this country. Within a short period, the House of Representatives and the Senate passed legislation, and on April 16, 1862 President Lincoln signed the D.C. Emancipation Proclamation.

Mr. Speaker, let me read to you from a history of the Nation's Capital written by M. Bryant in 1960 that explains the significance of the D.C. Emancipation Proclamation. He said:

The proclamation brought to a close an issue about which the anti-slavery Congress had raged for years. As well as placed on the statute books the preliminary measure of what proved to be national policy that would not merely destroy the chains from the slaves, but raise them to civil and political equality.

That was done with an act of Congress.

The Congress could not really set free the slaves in the District of Columbia though. What Congress did was to recognize what God intended from the beginning: that all men are created equal, and all men are created free. All Congress could do was to recognize that which God had intended.

Abraham Lincoln affixed his signature to that great document. That began the pealing of bells in the District of Columbia. The pealing of the bells said the Nation's Capital shall no longer be a stronghold for slavery.

Here are the words of the document that was the precursor of the Emancipation Proclamation:

Be it enacted by the Senate and the House of Representatives of the United States of America, in Congress assembled, that all persons held to service or labor within the District of Columbia by reason of African descent are hereby discharged and freed of all claims of service of labor. From and after passage of this Act, neither slavery or voluntary servitude shall hereafter exist in said district.

Those were the words.

Nine months later he did something else quite significant. Spurred on by Congress to set the slaves free in the District of Columbia, President Lincoln, by Executive proclamation, issued the Emancipation Proclamation. Two years ago, I took to the Library of Congress my family and Loretta Carter Hanes—the wonderful lady who, along with her son, Peter, has revived the D.C. Emancipation Commemoration ceremony in this city. There, we read the words of one of the original drafts of the Emancipation Proclamation. It

was an extremely moving event. Reading these words, Loretta's knees buckled and she turned to me and said: "I have to sit down because of the majesty of seeing one of the original drafts penned by Abraham Lincoln."

This is one of the few documents Lincoln signed with his full first name, "Abraham". Lincoln did this because he wanted these two documents, the two Emancipation Proclamations, to be among the most remembered and revered of everything that he signed into law as a President. Listen to these words:

That on the first day of January, in the year of our Lord, 1863, all persons held as slaves within any State or designated part of a State, the people whereof shall then be remanded as the United States, shall be thenceforward and forever free.

#### REPUBLICANS CARE ABOUT THE ENVIRONMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. MICA] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MICA. Mr. Speaker and my colleagues, I took to the floor earlier today in response to charges from the other side.

With Earth Day coming up, the other side is bashing Republicans. Republicans are going to hurt the environment. They send an incorrect message to the American people. Let me take, if I may, a few minutes and set the record straight.

First of all, probably most of the Members and the young people who have come here to serve in Congress do not realize, Mr. Speaker, that in fact the Environmental Protection Agency is a Republican idea. It was started and proposed by President Nixon in 1972. But the idea was not to create a huge bureaucracy. The idea was to set some national standards, because Republicans want clean air. Republicans want clean water. Republicans want clean land. We have children. We breathe the air. We drink the water. We want our children to inherit a land that is environmentally protected and clean and secure.

So it is a Republican idea that we are talking about. But the idea was not to pay more and get less. In fact, the Republican idea was to set some national standards of regulation. But let us look at what has happened. Just take a minute and look at this. Since today, we have 18,000 Federal bureaucrats in the Environmental Protection Agency, not to mention thousands of contract employees, and their job is to pump out rules.

You think they might be in my State of Florida, but in fact they are scattered throughout 10 regional offices and 1,000 at a clip there. Then here in Washington, DC, we have 6,000 EPA employees within almost speaking distance of my voice.

Mr. Speaker, we have 6,000 EPA Federal bureaucrats who, again, their re-

sponsibility is to pump out more rules and regulations and justify their bureaucracy and their rulemaking ability. So we have seen that bureaucracy grow. In 1972, we did not have 47 of the 50 States that have full-blown environmental protection agencies. Almost every city, every county, every State has full-blown authorities.

Let us look at the programs that they talk about, the gentleman from New Jersey came back and talked about. Do these programs work? Are we making polluters pay? Look at this headline from 1993: "EPA Lets Polluters Off Hook." So polluters are not paying under the current law. So this misinformation is incorrect.

These are the facts. Now, of the sites that we have in Superfund, a program which was well-intended, are we cleaning up the Superfund? Wrong. Look at the number of sites. We have over 2,000 sites, and only a handful have been cleaned up at great expense. So we are not cleaning up the sites, and that is according to GAO reports. They do not want to deal with the facts. Then a GAO report that was released in 1994, it says: "Are we cleaning up the sites that are most hazardous to public health, safety and welfare? And the answer is no."

The report says EPA does not use risk to set priorities. You know what drives the cleanup? Political pressure. That is what this report says. That is what Republicans are trying to change. We say why pay more and get less? Superfund is a disaster. You know who gets the money in this? The lawyers and the people who do studies. About 80 percent of the billions of dollars that are expended on these programs go to the lawyers and the studies.

Mr. Speaker, I sit on the committee that oversees EPA. You know who does the studies? Another report by the General Accounting Office showed that the largest percentage of contractors are former EPA employees. An incestuous relationship. So this is what they want to keep. They want to keep the pollution. They want to let the polluters off the hook. They do not want the sites cleaned up that are hazardous to our children and our future. They want to pay more and get less. They want the attorneys and these fat cats from EPA who have gone into the private sector to keep milking the cow because the taxpayers are paying. This is what the argument is about, and the American people and this Congress must listen.

Republicans care about the environment. Republicans care about the land and the water and the air we breathe. The thing is, we are not getting our money's worth. The thing is, people are out there busting their buns to send money to Washington, and this is where the billions are going and the hazardous waste sites are not being cleaned up and priorities are not being met and promises are not being kept.